Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 21 Jul 94   Volume 94 : Issue 320

Today's Topics:
                    After 93 days, the wait is over!
                      Emergency TX on police freq.

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 20 Jul 94 17:47:13 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!pipex!doc.ic.ac.uk!cs.city.ac.uk!city!
nick@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: After 93 days, the wait is over!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Bob Wilkins n6fri <rwilkins@ccnet.com> wrote:
>David L. Sampson (DAVID_SAMPSON@QM.IS.LMSC.LOCKHEED.COM) wrote:
>: IMHO, 90+ days is absurd. I am going to write my US Representative,
>: Senators and the VP suggesting that they consider privitizing the amateur
>: license "issuing operation."
>You may want to do some research of other radio services that have
>privatized their licencing bureaus. A simple business radio service
>licence takes over thirty days and costs over two hundred fifty dollars.

In the UK they have "recently" handed the Radio Licence Issuing over to
"SSL" - Subscription Services Limited, and their service is ABYSMAL. I'm
surprised you haven't already heard from other UK amateurs... You post
your fee off, and the cheque is cashed immediately. You wait a month or
so, no licence, so you write and complain, wait another month, phone and
complain, eventually after 3 months you get sent 3 copies of your

license, and they're 3 months out of date!

--
Nick Waterman - inet nick@cimio.co.uk - ax25 G7RZQ @ GB7GFD.#42.GBR.EU
   "Out of paper error reading drive C:" - MS-DOS
None of the opinions above belong to anybody at all, probably.

Date: 20 Jul 1994 12:37:13 -0400
From: news1.digex.net!access.digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Emergency TX on police freq.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <30hjkh$pqn@ccnet.ccnet.com> rwilkins@ccnet.com writes:

> The fellow who gave up his radio in san diego must have lost his head in the
> emergency. Every one knows that there is at least one amateur repeater at
> county sheriffs radio sites for the local races or ares groups. We all
> know that the local amateur radio repeaters are far better than most
> sheriffs radio systems ... why do you think they are going to 800 MHz
> trunked systems?

This presumes, in the case of an out-of-area amateur, that there is a CONTROL
OPERATOR MONITORING THE #$%&*#@ REPEATER AS REQUIRED BY FCC REGULATIONS!!!!!!

I have had a license since 1978, and I have lost count of the times I have
called MAYDAY on every repeater I could reach on two bands when I had a
CAPITAL S Situation and have my only response be the courtesy beep and/or
squelch tail.

Do this while you're the sole EMT (and sole person with a radio) on scene
attempting a seven-patient triage (all red and yellow tags) and you can easily
see why I think the above quoted statement is a bunch of horse hockey.

When the system works, it works well. When it doesn't, it will do so at a
time calculated to cause maximum grief. If alternatives that in other
cirucumstances would permit a necessity defense are precluded by FCC
enforcement, the amateur community is risking a black eye the next time an
emergency arises.

Frank Ney EMT-A N4ZHG LPVa NRA ILA GOA CCRTKBA 'M-O-U-S-E'

--
"Apparently on New Texas, killing a politician was not _malum in se_, and was
malum prohibitorum only to the extent that what the politician got was in
excess of what he deserved."
     -H. Beam Piper, _Lone Star Planet/A Planet For Texans_

```
------------------------------

Date: Wed, 20 Jul 1994 13:21:07 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!jobone!ukma!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!
xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <071294174505Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,<$P$8kiubGMn0066yn@access.digex.net>,
<301dg0$gbg@news.iastate.edu>, <30hkfl$feh@grex.cyberspa
Subject : Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

In article <30hkfl$feh@grex.cyberspace.org> mcs@cyberspace.org (Nicholas McLarty)
 writes:


>One of the reasons why they require a knowledge for CW is to:
>    a) Preserve the original mode of communication for DX Amateur Radio
>    b) Provide for an international way of communicating

>I know alot of lids, kids, space cadets, radio shack ht users, rubber duck
>proponents, and cb lingo differendos who just sit on the 2-meter band and
>yack away, and I think that's fine...but you should also get into HF
                                      ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>operation and do AT LEAST a little CW.  I know one person who took the 5
^^^^^^^^^^
>WPM test just to have it, and he HATES CW.  Go figure.

>73 de -.- -... ---.. .-. -... ..-. -..-. ..... (KB8RBF/5)

Nick,
     I am sure you have gotten enough followups on your post by now to
realize that they are coming to HF.  But they are going to do it their
way--codeless!

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov

============================================================================
= Cooperation requires participation.  Competition teaches cooperation. =
============================================================================

       ..._  .. ..._  .-   _ . .-.. . __. .-. ._ .__. .... _.__

------------------------------

Date: Wed, 20 Jul 1994 19:20:13 GMT
```

From: walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <306t78$i9j@agate.berkeley.edu>, <307oau$ej0@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>,
<carreiroCt6F4n.Gux@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: Thoughts on CW testing

In article <carreiroCt6F4n.Gux@netcom.com>,
Paul Carreiro <carreiro@netcom.com> wrote:
 : Please suggest how YOU would improve the testing over what is done
 : today.
 : Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)

>Well Bill, since you asked...
>If I had a magic wand that I could waive over the FCC, I would institute
>limited license terms on all Amateur Radio classes renewable only uppon
>passage of a comprehensive test showing that the licensee is worthy of
>holding that level of license. You don't pass, you slip down a level and
>privaleges are taken away until you can again show that you have attained
>the level of competance required for a higher license. If you're at the
>bottom of the license structure, and you don't pass the re-test, your
>license is revolked until you again can show your competance level is at
>the correct level. That would be my one dying wish in this world.

Fair enough, thanks for the response although I do think it is
prety draconian. Before such periodic testing would be called for,
I think a far better case can be made for retesting of such things
as medical license credentials, drivers licenses, engineering
licenses, etc. The reality though is most people begin
specializing after attaining whatever general licensing requirements
are needed, and I'd not be surprised to find some experts who would
fail on a broad testing basis. I know I can't do 13wpm anymore :-)

>In my opinion, the competance level of incomming Amateurs has been dropping
>off over the past 10 years. Yes, we're breeding appliance operators these
>days. The current test program almost promotes such operators. So too
>do the manufacterers, but you can hardly blame them. After all, business is
>business. All we can hope for is a change to the current testing program.
>Realistic, up-to-date and comprehensive tests WITHOUT actual question pools
>available is what I pray for.

Remember though that the license isn't intended to state that you are
an expert, just that you have a certain knowledge level which brings
certain privaledges of operation. My complaint (and others) is that
the CW testing is not relavent to many additional operating privaledges
nor should it be held in such esteem as it being the sole pass/fail
operating mode.

>What I have stated is not a proposal, for I am realistic in what changes
>can be brought forth in today's "get as many new hams as possible" and
>"why should I have to learn that stuff if I'm not going to use it?"
>atmosphere. It is simply my wish, and I am absolutely convinced that
>Amateur Radio would be a better service in the long run if that wish were
>granted. Also, I have purposefully left out specific details as to what
>would constitute a competancy level. Squabbling about that level of detail
>is useless, futile and I will not respond to such arguments.
>I welcome all constructive comments, pro or con.
>Paul N6HCS

Fair enough, thanks for at least providing your views. We obviously
disagree, but I think we both have the interests of amateur radio at
heart. We just differ as to the role that testing should be used.

Cheers & 73,

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ   email via UUCP   bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays   email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

----

Date: Wed, 20 Jul 94 18:04:12 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!pipex!doc.ic.ac.uk!cs.city.ac.uk!city!
nick@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <405@ted.win.net>, <30ehqb$ofg@news.iastate.edu>,
<Ct5xv3.8Eu@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Does CW as a pre-req

In article <Ct5xv3.8Eu@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> wrote:
>In article <30ehqb$ofg@news.iastate.edu> twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu writes:
[blah blah]
>Hmmm, no name nor call again. I don't know what to call you other
>than Mr. 3061sk$7ne:

OK, so it's off-topic, BUT, look closely and you'll see
"twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu" as his address. If you have a half-decent
internet connection you'll find you can type "finger
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu", and it'll tell you, amongst other things:

Login name: TWP77   In real life: TURNER WILLIAM J

Even if you don't have the "finger" command you can often "telnet <site>
79", and type the name as the first line.

Nick
--
Nick Waterman - inet nick@cimio.co.uk - ax25 G7RZQ @ GB7GFD.#42.GBR.EU
  "Out of paper error reading drive C:" - MS-DOS
None of the opinions above belong to anybody at all, probably.

Date: 19 Jul 1994 18:57:24 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!chnews!
scorpion.ch.intel.com!jbromley@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <395@ted.win.net>, <1994Jul14.155750.12239@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<404@ted.win.net>ew
Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

In article <404@ted.win.net>, Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> wrote:

{replying to Gary Coffman about simple AM and FM transmitters}

>Gary, if this is the case, and if it's as easy to get such a rig
>operating once it's built, then we have a serious mystery on our
>hands: where are all the simple FM, or AM, or DSB rigs? There are a
>number of possible answers.   {W5GYJ does a bit of editing here}

>1) They're being built, but somehow nobody I've talked to is aware of it.

No, they are not being built.

>2) They're not being built because they're more complicated to build
>   or align than you suggest.

Well, if the current lot of amateur radio kit makers would get off
their egos and spend a bit more effort assembly-testing their products,
(as Heathkit did with Benton Harbor housewives) the complication
factor could be substantially reduced for VHF FM kit radios. And the
price would not have to take a hit either.

>3) They're not being built because they don't offer enough performance
>   to make the effort worthwhile, or

It is well to keep in mind that DSB AM is an illegal mode for technician
class amateurs below 30 MHz. And it is used very little on VHF.
FM is much more viable on VHF, but channelized operation places stronger

requirements on frequency stability. So, legal restrictions and
good operating practices rule out a lot here.

>4) Our no-codes just aren't interested in building, in which case we
>   had better re-examine the entire Tech license experiment, because
>   the big argument for it, the one that convinced me, was that there
>   were all these sharp characters who would jump into the hobby if
>   they just didn't have to learn the code....

I don't think they are interested in winding their own coils and cutting
their own capacitors from shim stock. I think they are interested in
building their own antennas, interfacing their off-the-shelf radios
to their computers through an inexpensive TNC, eliminating RFI in
their mobiles and pursuing other radio system integration tasks.

> Have we instead just duplicated GMRS with more channels?

That is actually a rather good paradigm to follow. We could do
a lot worse.

>Having been spared all that tedious CW learning, where have they spent
>their time?

Probably being less obsessed with amateur radio. Let's face it, we
have created so many hurdles to operating in the service that we
have self-selected dedicated fanatics as active operators. And we have
moved ourselves way out of the mainstream of society.

>I don't care if people build CW projects or FM projects, any more than
>I care if they own red cars or blue cars. I just see an awful lot of
>CW rigs being built, and I think the reason is the *combination* of
>ease of construction *and* reward of operation. If you have another
>explanation, let us hear it.

I think it is the result of HF legal restrictions and radically
different operational modes on VHF. And economics. I think if
a straight-forward, reliable and capable VHF transceiver kit was
available at a reasonable price, there would be a lot of building
going on among technician-class amateurs.

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jbromley@sedona.intel.com> (I do not speak for Intel)

Date: Wed, 20 Jul 1994 18:02:59 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!
netcom.com!greg@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <304u2e$gl7@fnnews.fnal.gov>, <306g76$20i@news.u.washington.edu>,
<1994Jul15.205054.1463@mixcom.mixcom.com>0
Subject : Re: 11 meters taking it back!!

How can amateur radio justify such an idea, when, as a service, we have
historically under-utilized thAe adjacent 10-meter band, and now are
beginning to build a history of under-utilization on the 12-meter band?

Greg

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #320
****